UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,978	06/29/2001	Michael Bradford Ault	AUS920010373US1	9274

7590	12/15/2004

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
POLTORAK, PIOTR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-40 have been examined.

Priority

2. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in
this application is 6/29/2001.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because handwritten numbers and words are
not consistently legible. For example, number 8 in "Page 3 of 8" *(where 3
changes depending on the number of the page presented)* resembles the
capital letter "B". Similarly, objects 506 and 508 in Fig. 5 list a "registry
adapt?r". Also, positioning of the general description "Lin et al. ... Adapter
Framework ..." where it is detached from the particular figure would add to
the clarity. For example, description on pg. 1 could mislead one to interpret
that only Fig. 1 and not Fig. 2 is related to "User Registry Adapter
Framework". In addition, placing the reference number: "Lin et al. A....." is
not understood and should be avoided as it may not be relevant to the issued
patent.
Server 408 presented in the specification (pg. 13 lines 7 and 10) is not found
in Fig. 4. Similarly the "registry adapter" 508 *(the specification, pg. 14 lines
18 and 20)* is not found in Fig. 5. The step 910 in Fig. 9 is not addressed in
the specification.

4. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid
abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet

should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of

the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a

drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from

the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be

renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the

several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets

may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The

replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page

header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the

next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 6-11, 15-21, 25-30, and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e) as being anticipated by *Fujiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6301710)*.

6. As per claims 1 and 10 *Fujiwara* teaches a system and method for creating

a substitute registry when automatically installing an update program

(abstract) and the install module retrieving registry information from the

information file *(col. 3 lines 1-7)* which reads on receiving a registry-

independent instruction to perform an operation on the user registry; and

responsive to receiving the registry-independent instruction, executing

registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry.

Fig. 10 and col. 10 lines 7-59 read on issuing a registry-independent

instruction to a registry adapter to perform an operation on the user registry,

and responsive to the registry adapter's executing registry-dependent

instructions to perform the operation on the user registry, receiving a result of

the operation.

7. As per claim 39 *Fujiwara* teaches the module updating the client computer

configuration files *(col. 2 lines 65-67)*. *Fujiwara* discloses the client including

a CPU, RAM, an I/O and a system bus *(Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 24-36)* which reads

on a data system including a bus system, a processing unit connected to the

bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor and

memory. The teaching combined with the module execution *(mentioned*

above in regard to claims 1 and 10) reads on the processing unit executing

the set of instruction to perform receiving a registry independent instruction to

perform an operation on a user registry, and executing registry-dependent instructions to perform the operation on the user registry.

8. Claims 20, 29 and 40 are substantially equivalent to claims 1, 10 and 39; therefore claims 20, 29 and 40 are similarly rejected.

9. As per claim 2 the registry-independent instruction is a function call as col. 2 lines 65-67 show that the client computer configuration files are updated by a module.

10. As per claims 6 and 8-9 *Fujiwara* teaches the registry including data objects *(col. 6 lines 32-48)*. Retrieving registry information inherently will perform an operation *(read registry)* with respect to a data object in the registry.

11. As per claim 7 *Fujiwara* teaches creating a uniquely-named substitute registry in the computer system's software registries *(col. 3 lines 3-5)*.

12. As per claim 19 *Fujiwara* teaches that notification of the update procedure has been completed *(col. 10 lines 54-56)*.

13. Claims 11, 15-18, 21, 25-28, 30 and 34-38 are substantially equivalent to claims 2, 6-9 and 19; therefore claims 11, 15-18, 21, 25-28, 30 and 34-38 are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3, 12, 22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Fujiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6301710)* in view of *Qureshi*

(U.S. Patent No. 5758154).

Fujiwara teaches a function call as discussed above.

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the function being a call to a function in a

dynamically-linked library (DLL).

Qureshi teaches the function call to a function in DLL *(Qureshi, col. 4 lines*

31-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to implement the function call to a function in DLL as

taught by *Qureshi.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to perform such a modification in order to simplify writing and synchronizing

configuration information registration *(Qureshi, abstract).*

15. Claims 3, 5, 12, 14, 22, 24, 31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over *Fujiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6301710)* in view of

Murray et al. (William H. Murray and Chris H. Pappas, "Windows

programming. An Introduction", ISBN: 0078815363).

Fujiwara teaches a function call as discussed above.

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the function call to a function in a

dynamically-linked library (DLL).

Murray et al. teach a function call being to a function in DLL *(Murray et al., pg.*

15 § 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the function call to a function in DLL as taught by *Murray et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to re-use already available procedures *(Murray et al., pg. 15 § 3)*.

Fujiwara does not explicitly teach the function call being to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

Murray et al. teach that when programming for Windows object-oriented programming is used, and that an object is an abstract data type that consists of a data structure and various functions that act on the data structure *(Murray et al., pg. 27 §2)* which reads on a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the function call to a function call being to a method of an object class in an object-oriented programming language as taught by *Murray et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to communicate in Windows environment and to simplify the program *(Murray et al., pg. 15 § 5-6)*.

16. Claims 4, 13, 23, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujiwara (U.S. Patent No. 6301710)* in view of *Qureshi (U.S. Patent No. 5758154)* and *Murray et al. (William H. Murray and Chris H. Pappas, "Windows programming. An Introduction", ISBN: 0078815363)* and in

further view of *Chang et al. (Ku-Yaw Chang, Lih-Shyang Chen and Chi-Kong Lai, "Document-View-Presentation Pattern")*.

Fujiwara in view of *Qureshi* and *Murray et al.* teaches a function call as discussed above.

Fujiwara in view of *Qureshi* and *Murray et al.* does not explicitly teach the function call being to a function that takes a structure data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry.

Chang et al. teach the function call being to a function that takes a structure data type as an argument, where in the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry *(pg. 9)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement the function call being to a function that takes a structure data type as an argument, wherein the structured data type represents a data object within the user registry as taught by *Chang et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to subscribe and unsubscribe objects *(Chang et al., pg. 9, §1)*.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571)272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through

Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to

3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free).

Signature

11/08/04

Date

GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100